Pages 1 - 11

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Before The Honorable Charles R. Breyer, Judge

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

VS.) NO. CR 21-00013 CRB

MARC NUNEZ,

Defendant.

San Francisco, California Wednesday, March 1, 2023

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

APPEARANCES:

For Plaintiff:

STEPHANIE M. HINDS

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

450 Golden Gate Avenue, 11th Floor San Francisco, California 94102

BY: KEVIN YEH

ASSISTANT UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

For Defendant:

JODI LINKER

FEDERAL PUBLIC DEFENDER 450 Golden Gate Avenue Room 19-6884, Box 36106

BY: ELISSE M. LAROUCHE

ASSISTANT FEDERAL PUBLIC DEFENDER

Also Present: Katrina Chu, U.S. Probation

REPORTED BY: Ana Dub, RMR, RDR, CRR, CCRR, CRG, CCG

CSR No. 7445, Official United States Reporter

Wednesday - March 1, 2023 10:00 a.m. 1 2 PROCEEDINGS ---000---3 (Defendant present, out of custody.) 4 5 THE CLERK: Okay. The next matter is U.S.A. vs. Marc 6 Nunez. MR. YEH: Good morning, Your Honor. Kevin Yeh on 7 behalf of the United States. 8 THE COURT: Good morning. 9 THE CLERK: This is Criminal Action CR 21-0013. 10 11 MS. LAROUCHE: Good morning, Your Honor. Elisse Larouche on behalf of Marc Nunez, who's present and out of 12 13 custody. PROBATION OFFICER CHU: And good morning, Your Honor. 14 15 Katrina Chu with U.S. Probation. 16 THE COURT: Good morning. 17 So my clerk advised me that the Government wants to 18 continue sentencing, the hearing in this matter. 19 And do you have a reason for that? 20 MR. YEH: Yes, Your Honor. I'm very sorry to waste the Court's time, and I apologize 21 for doing this with such short notice. But the Government 22 23 would like to request continuing the sentencing for 30 days so that we can fulfill our obligations under the Crime Victims 24 25 Rights Act to contact all potential victims about the case,

which we unfortunately haven't finished doing yet.

We were unable to reach a stipulation with defense counsel, who we informed yesterday, which is why the Court is hearing about it for the first time today.

I don't make any excuses, but there are at least three more victims that we would like to contact, and so we're hoping to get an additional 30 days to complete that task.

MS. LAROUCHE: Your Honor, the Government did contact us yesterday. And not to be difficult, but we don't believe it's in the -- I don't believe it's in the best interest of my client to continue, so we did not agree to stipulate.

THE COURT: Okay. Well, I thought I would take two minutes and explain where I am in the sentencing process because it may inform the next 30 days or whatever period of time is necessary.

The Presentence Report contains a great deal of information. The nature of the information, for the most part, has been inappropriate conduct with teenagers. There is, however, an allegation that there was inappropriate conduct directed towards a child, a young child, and I have the victim's statement there. I also have defense counsel's series of statements, series of arguments or statements, or whatever it is, rebutting that allegation.

And that incident or series of incidents involving a child would drastically change the sentence that the Court would

impose. If I were to consider it as relevant conduct or as conduct germane to a decision as to sentencing, even though it may not, quote, enhance the sentence from a guideline point of view, it would certainly influence in a substantial way the sentence that I would impose.

After all, if teenagers are involved -- 17, 16, that age -- in the conduct of the defendant, that would be one way I would look at it. If it involved a six-year-old or a five-year-old or a seven-year-old or an eight-year-old, that is to say, and I'm just using that as an example, I would give a totally different sentence. And I think every judge would, by the way. So I don't think I'm surprising anybody by that declaration.

So I will give the Government the opportunity to present whatever argument or evidence they want to which corroborates the young boy's victim impact statement, which, of course, was written by the parents.

And not for a moment am I suggesting that this child wasn't victimized in a totally terrible way. The question is, is the defendant respon- -- is he the person who did it. And the defense has come in and, quite credibly, raised questions as to that statement.

So that's what's of concern to the Court. I don't know how else to put it. I mean, it's not just lining up more people or any of that. I understand what has been uncovered by

the police report and -- pardon me -- the Probation Report. 1 I also think it's not really an issue -- a couple of 2 things are not an issue. One, it's not an issue as to the 3 4 number of images because four circuits have held that even if 5 it's duplicative images, it counts, each image counts. that's the position of the United States Sentencing Commission, 6 7 and that's the position of the Sentencing Guidelines as well in the application note. So we're over 300, any way you look --8 I think it's -- is it over 300? 9 MS. LAROUCHE: Yes, Your Honor. 10 11 MR. YEH: Yes. THE COURT: We're over 300 any way you look at it. 12 The issue as to whether or not a particular person in a 13 particular video which showed only a portion of that person is 14 15 a minor or is not a minor is something I don't have to decide. I accept the Government's presentation of that. It was 16 17 verified by the Probation Department. But it's not going to be 18 material to the sentencing. Okay? MS. LAROUCHE: Understood, Your Honor. 19 20 THE COURT: All right. So don't waste your time on 21 that. I turn to the defense. Don't waste -- no, no. 22 23 Again, to the prosecution. The prosecution makes the

argument, in the special assessment of \$5,000, that it doesn't make any difference that he's indigent. Is that the argument?

24

25

No, Your Honor. We just believe that the MR. YEH: defendant either currently has the ability to pay or will upon release from any term of imprisonment. Well, so does -- everybody has the --THE COURT: anybody released from imprisonment. By the way, that's not what the statute says. You better read the statute. I read it for the first time this morning. I read it wrong, and then I reread it, thanks to my law clerk. But the difference between a special assessment of -- the typical \$100 special assessment and this, I think, is for the special assessment of \$100, it applies to everybody. applies to non-indigent. So that's a big distinction. I think he is indigent, and I'm not going to -- so my inclination is not to impose that, given his financial situation. But I think that's all by the by. I think the big issue -- and believe me, it's an important issue for this defendant and for the integrity of the sentencing process. It's a big issue to figure out what, if anything -- what has happened in the past, because that's the conduct that I have to

sentence on and there are two very, very different types of sentencing that would be imposed.

Okay.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. LAROUCHE: Your Honor.

THE COURT: Let me answer your questions. I wanted to

sort of talk about this --1 2 MS. LAROUCHE: Okay. THE COURT: -- so you see where I'm coming from. 3 By the way, I have to tell you, even if the Government 4 5 hadn't requested a continuance, I would have given one. MS. LAROUCHE: Well, Your Honor, I just want to pause 6 7 for a moment just so that -- make sure we're all on the same page, that the Government has taken the position that they 8 couldn't prove those allegations and wouldn't be putting on a 9 presentation of such --10 11 THE COURT: They can -- I'm giving them the 12 opportunity. 13 Here is the problem. The question really is: Is there evidence, is there evidence of a type, since it's in dispute, 14 15 that would satisfy the requirements of, well, 6A1.3 and 16 Rule 32, Rule 32(i)(3)(B) and (C). So there's a whole 17 mechanism. You see, I can't strike it. I think what I've been doing is wrong up to now, which is 18 I've asked the Probation Department to amend their report to 19 take out this and take out that. I don't know that I can do 20 They have an obligation; they have a legal obligation to 21 22 present evidence, to present information to me that may impact 23 sentencing. That's their obligation.

If I disagree with it, if I don't want to consider it for the very reasons that you gave, I have to leave it in the

24

25

Probation Report but append to the J&C my views as to why I'm not considering it for sentencing purposes.

You see, I think this is a perfect example, a perfect example of what I would have to do. So I don't want to walk into it and blindside any lawyer. I want them to see what's going on in my mind so that they come back and they say, well -- they may come back and they say: You've raised, like, ten different issues of why you think it's not -- why you think it's not your client.

Let's leave it at that. Okay?

MS. LAROUCHE: Yes.

THE COURT: And to me, they're powerful reasons.

They're powerful reasons.

So I want to give the Government the opportunity to look at those reasons. I know they've had an opportunity to look at the reasons, but to say what they want to say about them.

Now, they may very well come back and say, "We're submitted; we're not going to argue that."

Okay? But you see, that makes the whole difference in sentencing. Now, you can argue to me it shouldn't; but the problem really is this: The Sentencing Guidelines for child pornography are the least -- the second-least-followed Sentencing Guidelines by federal judges.

And I have to do a couple of things. One thing I have to do correctly is do the right math on the Sentencing Guidelines.

But then where I come out in terms of variance is enormously significant. And let me just go on a bit about that.

The normal child pornography case that I have seen brought by the U.S. Attorney's Office involves children. And I don't mean children -- anybody under 18. I mean children who are from one year old to ten years old and then sometimes teenagers. But this seemed to be a case of almost all, I think, teenagers.

Now, I'm not saying it's not a crime, but I'm saying it's a very different crime from all of the images that I've seen, unfortunately, over 25 years where there have been horrendous photographs of abuse of infants. Of infants.

Well, I mean, you see that, and you have a -- as a human being, you have a reaction a particular way, which is different from the reaction that you would get if somebody is 17 years old and maybe even lies about his age, or 18 and lies about his age, of which this is replete, the Sentencing Memoranda.

So everybody got a picture now? Is it clear on all sides what I'm interested in? Any issues?

MR. YEH: Crystal clear, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Ms. Larouche?

MS. LAROUCHE: Your Honor, we understand -- definitely agree that the allegations drastically change what would happen here, and that's why we made such a full fund effort to show the issues with them. So that's understood, Your Honor.

```
I would ask for leave to file supplemental briefing.
 1
 2
              THE COURT: Granted.
              MS. LAROUCHE: Thank you. Particularly to the issue
 3
     of whether this information should stay in the PSR,
 4
 5
    understanding what Your Honor has laid out.
              THE COURT: Granted. Granted. You can say anything
 6
 7
     you want to.
              MS. LAROUCHE: Thank you.
 8
              THE COURT: I'm not limiting you in any way.
 9
              MS. LAROUCHE:
10
                             Thank you.
11
              THE COURT:
                          Okay.
              THE CLERK: The next hearing date, April 19th at
12
     10:30.
13
                       That's fine. Thank you.
14
              MR. YEH:
15
              THE COURT:
                          Okay.
                                 Thank you.
16
              MS. LAROUCHE: Sorry, Lashanda. Just one moment.
          What was that?
17
              THE CLERK: April 19 at 10:30.
18
              MS. LAROUCHE: Okay. Thank you very much.
19
              THE CLERK: Okay.
20
21
                        Thank you, Your Honor.
              MR. YEH:
              PROBATION OFFICER CHU:
                                      Thank you.
22
23
              THE COURT: Thank you.
          Thank the Probation Department too.
24
25
              PROBATION OFFICER CHU:
                                      Thank you.
```

1	THE COURT: Very, very careful report.
2	(Proceedings adjourned at 10:16 a.m.)
3	000
4	
5	CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER
6	I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript
7	from the record of proceedings in the above-entitled matter.
8	
9	DATE: Monday, March 13, 2023
L0	
L1	A 4
L2	ana Dub
L3	
L4	Ana Dub, RMR, RDR, CRR, CCRR, CRG, CCG CSR No. 7445, Official United States Reporter
L5	con No. 7113, official officea beaced Reporter
L6	
L7	
L8	
L9	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	